7 8 9 10 For the Northern District of California 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1

2

3

4

5

6

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

XIAOHUA HUANG,

No. C 18-06654 WHA

Plaintiff,

v.

NEPHOS INC.,

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR TEMPORARY STRAINING ORDER AND PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION

Defendant.

Pro se plaintiff Xiaohua Huang moves for a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction — ten months after filing the instant action — to prohibit defendant Nephos Inc. "from selling its networking chips" within the United States, "especially selling its chips to Amazon.com Inc." (Dkt. No. 67 at 1). The motion is **DENIED**.

In seeking a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction, plaintiff must demonstrate that: (1) serious questions going to the merits were raised, (2) the balance of hardships tips sharply in the plaintiff's favor, (3) there is a likelihood of irreparable harm, and (4) that the injunction is in the public interest. All. for the Wild Rockies v. Cottrell, 632 F.3d 1127, 1134–36 (9th Cir. 2011) (incorporating factors from Winter v. Nat. Res. Def. Council, Inc., 555 U.S. 7 (2008)); Stuhlbarg Int'l Sales Co. v. John D. Brush & Co., 240 F.3d 832, 839 n.7 (9th Cir. 2001) ("[O]ur analysis is substantially identical for the injunction and the TRO.").

Here, plaintiff has failed to establish, at the very least, a likelihood of irreparable harm. Plaintiff complains that defendant has not yet produced relevant source code, continues to file

United States District Court For the Northern District of California

motions to strike plaintiff's infringement contentions, is refusing to "pay any royalty and damage[s]" to plaintiff, and lowballed plaintiff during settlement discussions (Dkt. No. 67 at 4–5). He contends that without a temporary restraining order, defendant "will never show respect to the Court and [plaintiff's] intellectual property" and will "make million USD [sic] in selling its chips to Amazon.com Inc. alone" (id. at 5). None of these contentions show irreparable harm. Plaintiff's failure to establish this factor alone is sufficient to deny his motion for a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 30, 2019.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE